

REMARKS

The Examiner's action dated February 3, 2009, has been received, and its contents carefully noted.

The prior art rejections of claims 1-4 and 9-12 as anticipated by either Bouleau or Walther are respectfully traversed for the reason that the novel pressing iron according to the invention is not disclosed in either of the applied references.

The present invention is directed to a novel pressing iron having a first steam chamber for ordinary ironing and a second chamber for obtaining a surplus of steam when the iron is in the horizontal position, or a jet of steam when the iron is in the vertical position.

In order for a pressing iron to have the capabilities contemplated by the present invention, it is essential that the second steam chamber be formed in such a manner that liquid is prevented from flowing from that steam chamber to steam outlet holes when the iron is in the vertical position. Claim 1 has now been amended in order to more clearly define this aspect of the contribution of the invention over the prior art. Support for the additions to claim 1 will be found in the specification, for example at page 4, lines 7-15.

Neither of the applied references discloses a second steam chamber having the structure now defined in claim 1.

Bouleau discloses a pressing iron having a second steam chamber 20 that is only usable to generate steam when the iron is in a vertical position. As is readily apparent from the illustration provided in Figure 6 of the drawings of this reference, if water were introduced into chamber 20 when the iron is in the horizontal position, that water will leak out through the steam exit hole shown in Figure 6 at the bottom of that chamber. As described throughout the Bouleau specification, for example at column 3, lines 32-45, water is introduced into the second steam chamber 20 only when the iron is in a vertical position.

Walther, on the other hand, discloses an iron that is intended to be used, and is capable of being used, only when the iron is in a horizontal position. The purpose of the second steam chamber 220 is only to provide additional steam, as disclosed, for example, at column 1, lines 51-52. As described at column 3, lines 17-28, the second steam chamber 220 is prolonged by two channels 222 which are connected at their end by a hole passing vertically through body 2 to two channels 223. These holes are not illustrated in the reference drawing but, based on the written description, it is clear that they would be disposed approximately at the

locations of the ends of the lead lines associated with the reference numeral "222". One of the holes "passing vertically through body 2 to two channels 223" is visible in Figure 2b as a small circle just to the left of the reference numeral "223".

What this mean is if the iron disclosed in this reference were placed in the vertical position while water is being introduced into chamber 220, that water would flow out through the holes passing through body 2 and would then leak out through the steam outlet openings.

It is thus clear that neither of the applied references discloses an iron having a second steam chamber that is "used to obtain a surplus of steam when the iron is in the horizontal position" and that is "bounded by walls that prevent any liquid flowing from said second steam chamber to said steam outlet holes when said iron is in the vertical position", as now defined in claim 1. In other words, the structure defined in claim 1 is not found in either of the applied references, and this structure enables the iron according to the present invention to operate in a manner that is beyond the capabilities of the irons disclosed in the two applied references.

Specifically, the iron disclosed by Bouleau cannot use the second steam chamber to produce steam when the iron is

operating in its horizontal position, while the iron disclosed by Walther is not intended to be used in a vertical position, and water can certainly not be supplied to the second steam chamber if the iron were in a vertical position.

In view of the foregoing, it is requested that the prior art rejections be considered and withdrawn, that the rejected claims be allowed, along with allowable claims 5-8, and that the application be found in allowable condition.

If the above amendment should not now place the application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to call undersigned counsel to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.  
Attorneys for Applicant

By /jmf/  
Jay M. Finkelstein  
Registration No. 21,082

JMF:smb  
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197  
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528  
G:\BN\S\seb\Kubert1\pto\2009-05-04 Amendment.doc